1	DAVID CHIU, State Bar #189542		
2	City Attorney WAYNE K. SNODGRASS, State Bar #148137		
3	JAMES M. EMERY, State Bar #153630 KATE G. KIMBERLIN, State Bar #261017		
3	Deputy City Attorneys		
4	City Hall, Room 234  1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place		
5	San Francisco, California 94102-5408		
	Telephone: (415) 554-4628 (Emery) (415) 554-3847 (Kimberlin)		
6	Facsimile: (415) 554-4699		
7	E-Mail: jim.emery@sfcityatty.org kate.kimberlin@sfcityatty.org		
8			
9	Attorneys for Defendants CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO;		
9	LONDON BREED, Mayor of San Francisco in her official capacity; and		
10	CAROL ISEN, Human Resources Director, City a of San Francisco, in her official capacity	and County	
1	of San Trancisco, in her official capacity		
12			
	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
13	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
ا 4			
15	SELINA KEENE, MELODY FOUNTILA, MARK MCCLURE,	Case No. 22-cv-0158	77-JSW
16	Plaintiffs,		PPOSITION TO EX PARTE ND TO SHORTEN TIME O
ا 17	Fiamuris,	NOTICE FOR MO	TION TO ENTER ORDER
18	vs.	ON PLAINTIFFS' I PRELIMINARY IN	
10	CITY and COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO;		
19	LONDON BREED, Mayor of San Francisco in her official capacity; CAROL ISEN, Human	Hearing Date: Time:	September 23, 2022 9:00 a.m.
20	Resources Director, City and County of San	Judge:	Hon. Jeffrey S. White
21	Francisco, in her official capacity; DOES 1-100,	Location:	Oakland Courthouse, Courtroom 5, 2nd Floor
$_{22}$	Defendants.	Date Action Filed:	March 14, 2022
23		Trial Date:	None set
24			
25			
26			

Opposition – EPA re: OST for Motion for PI CASE NO. 22-cv-01587-JSW

27

28

Defendant City and County of San Francisco ("City") objects to Plaintiffs' Ex Parte 1 Application to Shorten Time of Notice from Motion to Enter Order on Plaintiff's Motion for 2 Preliminary Injunction (the "Ex Parte Motion"), filed with the Court on September 13, 2022 (Dkt. 28). 3 There is no emergency to warrant shortening of time, and none has been demonstrated via the Ex Parte 4 Motion. Plaintiffs' Motion to Enter Order on Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary Injunction ("Motion") 5 is also improper because the management of the Court's docket is entirely within the Court's sole 6 discretion. 7 Counsel for the City are also unavailable on September 23, 2022 for the noticed hearing on the 8 Ex Parte Motion. Counsel for Plaintiffs' did not consult with the City's attorneys before unilaterally 9 selecting a date on which neither of the attorneys for the City are available. (See Accompanying Decl. 10 of Kate Kimberlin). The City requested Plaintiffs re-notice their motion for a mutually agreeable date, 11 but Plaintiffs did not do so. The City is therefore unavailable for and does not plan to appear at the 12 noticed hearing on the Ex Parte Motion. 13 14 15 Dated: September 21, 2022 16 **DAVID CHIU** City Attorney 17 WAYNE K. SNODGRASS JAMES M. EMERY 18 KATE G. KIMBERLIN **Deputy City Attorneys** 19 20 By: /s/ Kate G. Kimberlin 21 JAMES M. EMERY KATE G. KIMBERLIN 22 Attorneys for Defendants 23 CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, MAYOR LONDON BREED and CAROL ISEN 24 25 26 27

Opposition – EPA re: OST for Motion for PI CASE NO. 22-cv-01587-JSW

28